

REMARKS

Please reconsider the present application in view of the above amendments and following remarks. Applicants thank the Examiner for carefully considering the present application.

Applicants are amending the section entitled "Related Applications" in the specification to specify the U.S. serial numbers for the related applications.

Claims 1-37 are currently pending. By way of this reply, claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 9, 12, 13, 15, 18-37 have been amended and new claims 38 and 39 have been added.

Response to Claim Objections

In the 3rd paragraph of the Office Action, Examiner has objected claims 8, 24, 25, 27, 29, 30, 36 and 37. Particularly, Examiner has objected to claims 8 and 27 for lack of antecedent basis for the recited language "the implicit search query." To address this concern, claims 8 and 27 have been amended to recite "the search query," which has antecedent basis in the parent claims. Examiner has objected to claims 24 and 37 for lack of antecedent basis for the recited language "the user search engine" and "the user engine." To address this concern, claims 24 and 37 have been amended to remove these limitations. Examiner has indicated language defects in claims 25 and 36 and suggested amendments. To address this concern, claims 25 and 36 have been amended following the suggestions. Examiner has objected to claim 29 for lack of antecedent basis for the recited language "the search engine." To address this concern, claim 29 has been amended to recite "a search engine" instead. Examiner has objected to claim 30 for lack of antecedent basis for the recited language "the article identifiers." To address this concern, claim 30 has been

amended to recite “the plurality of article identifiers” and depend from claim 29, which provide sufficient antecedent basis. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections to claims 8, 24, 25, 27, 29, 30, 36 and 37 is respectfully requested.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC § 101

In the 4th paragraph of the Office Action, Examiner has rejected claims 1-11 and 14-37 under 35 USC § 101, as allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Particularly, Examiner indicated that claims 1-11 and 14-24 as being non-statutory because they fail to “produce an end result that is either stored or displayed,” and that “An example of a tangible result would be displaying or returning a result after processing the query as demonstrated by claims 12 and 13.” See instant Office Action, pages 4 and 5.

By way of this reply, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite a limitation of “modifying the search result based on the second user search attribute; and returning the modified search result to the user.” Therefore, the method recited in independent claim 1 as amended produces a tangible and useful result – the returned modified search result. Therefore, independent claim 1 as amended recites statutory subject matter. Amended independent claim 22 includes similar language. Therefore, independent claim 22 and dependent claims are also directed to statutory subject matter for at least the same reasons.

As to claims 25-37, Examiner indicated that these claims are directed to non-statutory subject matter because they are directed toward a computer-readable medium, the meaning of which as disclose in the specification “covers non-statutory embodiments which improperly include network transmission lines.” Applicants do not concede that any of the embodiments in the specification (e.g. network transmission lines) are non-statutory embodiments.

However, to expedite prosecution of the application, Applicants have amended claims 25-37 to recite “computer-readable tangible medium.” Applicants submit that the addition of “tangible” limits the claims to only cover tangible embodiments and thereby renders the claims statutory.

Accordingly, in view of the above, claims 1-11 and 14-37 are at least now directed to statutory subject matter under § 101. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 101 rejections is respectfully requested.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 102(e) in View of Ducatel

In the 6th paragraph of the Office Action, Examiner rejects claims 1-3, 17-20, 22, 23, 25, 33, 34 and 36 under 35 USC § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0136405 to Ducatel et al. (“Ducatel”). For the reasons set forth below, these rejections are respectfully traversed.

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” See *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987); MPEP § 2131. Independent claim 1 has been amended to now recite a method processing a search query received from a user based on a search term derived from a first user search attribute, modifying the processed search query’s search result based on a second user search attribute, and returning the modified search result to the user. For example, the method can generate an implicit search query based on the first user search attribute, and integrate the implicit search query into the user’s search query. See, e.g., page 34, paragraph [00111], and Fig. 11. The method can rank the search result generated in response to the processed search query by

giving more weight to results from a particular website over the rest, as indicated by the second user search attribute. See, e.g., page 34, paragraph [00112], and Fig. 11. Therefore, the amended independent claim 1 beneficially recites a method that can provide users with personalized search experience. Amended independent claims 22, 25 and 36 include limitations similar to claim 1.

Ducatel, among other differences, does not disclose the claimed limitation of “modifying the search **result** based on the second user search attribute to generate a modified search result.” Ducatel, in contrast, discloses a system that modifies search **queries** from a user using a user profile. The user profile includes terms extracted from documents demonstrating the user's interests. When the user submits a query, Ducatel's search system prompts the user with a list of words generated from the profile. The user picks from the generated terms, and the system integrates the picked terms into the search query and sends it to a search engine. See Ducatel, paragraph [0065]. Ducatel fails to disclose modifying the result of the processed search query based on a user attribute received from a user profile as required by amended independent claims 1, 22, 25 and 36.

In view of the above, Ducatel fails to disclose each and every limitation recited in amended independent claims 1, 22, 25 and 36. Thus, amended independent claims 1, 22, 25 and 36 are patentably distinguishable over the cited reference. Dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reason. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 102 rejections is respectfully requested.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a) in View of Ducatel and Li

In the 8th paragraph of the Office Action, Examiner rejects claims 4-6, 8-13, 27-30 and 35 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable in view of Ducatel and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0099700 to Li (“Li”). For the reasons set forth below, these rejections are respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Ducatel fails to disclose each and every limitation of amended independent claims 1, 22, 25 and 36. Li similarly fails. For example, Li, which discloses a method to provide a focused search engine using information about a web document's index and category information (see Li, Summary, paragraph [0010]), is all-together silent as to modifying a search result based on an attribute received from a user profile, as required by the claimed invention. Accordingly, Li fails to at least disclose the limitation of amended independent claims 1, 22, 25 and 36 not disclosed or taught in Ducatel.

In view of the above, Ducatel and Li, whether considered singly or in combination, fail to disclose each and every limitation recited in amended independent claims 1, 22, 25 and 36. Thus, amended independent claims 1, 22, 25 and 36 are patentable over Ducatel and Li. Dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reason. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103 rejections is respectfully requested.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a) in View of Ducatel and Zhou

In the 9th paragraph of the Office Action, Examiner rejects claims 7 and 26 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable in view of Ducatel and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0059564 to Zhou (“Zhou”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Ducatel fails to disclose each and every limitation of amended independent claims 1, 22, 25 and 36. Zhou similarly fails. For example, Zhou, which discloses a method to retrieve hint sentences for people who are writing in non-native language (see Zhou, paragraph [0008-0010]), is all-together silent as to modifying a search result based on an attribute received from a user profile, as required by the claimed invention. Accordingly, Zhou fails to at least disclose the limitation of amended independent claims 1, 22, 25 and 36 not disclosed or taught in Ducatel.

In view of the above, Ducatel and Zhou, whether considered singly or in combination, fail to disclose each and every limitation recited in amended independent claims 1, 22, 25 and 36. Thus, amended independent claims 1, 22, 25 and 36 are patentable over Ducatel and Zhou. Dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reason. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103 rejections is respectfully requested.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a) in View of Ducatel and Bates

In the 10th paragraph of the Office Action, Examiner rejects claims 14 and 31 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable in view of Ducatel and U.S. Patent No. 6,850,934 to Bates et al. ("Bates"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Ducatel fails to disclose each and every limitation of amended independent claims 1, 22, 25 and 36. Bates similarly fails. Bates discloses a method to provide meaningful and relevant results to search queries by translating the search terms based on a regional profile or a user profile (e.g., translate "pop" to "soft drink" for a 15-year old and to "popular music" to a 25-year old). See Bates, col. 1, lines 65-67, col. 7, lines 6-45, and Figures 4 and 5. Bates is all-together silent as to modifying a search result based on an

attribute received from a user profile, as required by the claimed invention. Accordingly, Bates fails to at least disclose the limitation of amended independent claims 1, 22, 25 and 36 not disclosed or taught in Ducatel.

In view of the above, Ducatel and Bates, whether considered singly or in combination, fail to disclose each and every limitation recited in amended independent claims 1, 22, 25 and 36. Thus, amended independent claims 1, 22, 25 and 36 are patentable over Ducatel and Bates. Dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reason. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103 rejections is respectfully requested.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a) in View of Ducatel and Dumais

In the 11th paragraph of the Office Action, Examiner rejects claims 15, 16, 21, 24, 32 and 37 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable in view of Ducatel and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0267700 to Dumais et al. (“Dumais”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Ducatel fails to disclose each and every limitation of amended independent claims 1, 22, 25 and 36. Dumais similarly fails. Dumais discloses a method to facilitate information reuse by enabling users to find or retrieve previously contemplated information. See Dumais, paragraph [0005]. It creates a personal information indexing and retrieval system “by providing a unified index of all the information a person has seen, regardless of whether the information was observed as email, web pages, documents, calendar appointments.” See Dumais, paragraphs [0029] and [0030]. Dumais is all-together silent as to modifying a search result based on an attribute received from a user profile, as

required by the claimed invention. Accordingly, Dumais fails to at least disclose the limitation of amended independent claims 1, 22, 25 and 36 not disclosed or taught in Ducatel.

In view of the above, Ducatel and Dumais, whether considered singly or in combination, fail to disclose each and every limitation recited in amended independent claims 1, 22, 25 and 36. Thus, amended independent claims 1, 22, 25 and 36 are patentable over Ducatel and Dumais. Dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reason. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103 rejections is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicants have added new claims 38 and 39 for which Applicants request consideration and examination. Applicants respectfully submit that these are supported by the specification and are commensurate within the scope of protection to which Applicants believe they are entitled.

The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney if it would be beneficial to further advance the prosecution of the application.

Respectfully Submitted,
Stephen R. Lawrence et al.

Date: February 2, 2007

By: /Brian Hoffman/

Brian M. Hoffman, Reg. No. 39,713
Attorney for Applicants
Fenwick & West LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel.: (415) 875-2484
Fax: (415) 281-1350